

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the present application in view of the foregoing amendments and in view of the reasons that follow.

Acknowledgement of Claim for Priority:

Applicant notes with appreciation the acknowledge of claim for priority, as noted in the Office Action Summary. However, Box 1. in Section 12 was not checked, whereby Applicant did submit a certified copy of the priority document to the PTO, on February 16, 2001. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the PTO acknowledge receipt of the certified copy of the priority document.

Specification Amendments:

The specification has been amended to correct minor typographical and grammatical errors. No new matter has been added.

Drawing Objection:

In the Office Action, Figure 4 was objected to because it did not have a PRIOR ART label. By way of this amendment and reply, a replacement formal drawing sheet for Figure 4 is being submitted, which should overcome this objection.

Status of Claims:

Claim 13 is currently being canceled.

Claims 1-6 are currently being amended.

Claims 14-21 are currently being added.

This amendment adds, cancels and amends claims in this application. A detailed listing of all claims that are, or were, in the application, irrespective of whether the claims remain under examination in the application, is presented, with an appropriate defined status identifier.

After amending the claims as set forth above, claims 1-12 and 14-21 are now pending in this application.

Claim Objection – Claim 13:

In the Office Action, claim 13 was objected to for the reasons set forth on page 2 of the Office Action. Due to the cancellation of claim 13, this objection is now moot.

Claim Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. Section 112, first paragraph:

In the Office Action, claim 13 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 112, first paragraph, for the reasons set forth on page 3 of the Office Action. Due to the cancellation of claim 13, this rejection is now moot.

Claim Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. Section 112, second paragraph:

In the Office Action, claims 3, 4 and 13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite, for the reasons set forth on pages 3 and 4 of the Office Action. Due to the amendments made to claims 3 and 4, and due to the cancellation of claim 13, this rejection is believed to have been overcome.

Claim Rejection Over Prior Art:

In the Office Action, claims 1-12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,252,952 to Kung et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,741,705 to Nelson et al. and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,069,890 to White et al. This rejection is traversed with respect to the presently pending claims, for at least the reasons given below.

Independent Claims 1 and 2:

With respect to the rejection of independent claims 1 and 2, those claims have been amended to recite that the control bus forms a communications path for enabling the central control unit to control a time-division switch for the conventional type telephone sets and an IP switch for the LAN type telephone sets. See, for example, control bus 17 shown in Figures 1-3 of the drawings. Such a control bus that allows control signals to be sent from the central control unit to different types of devices on a hybrid type telephony system, is not taught or suggested by any of the cited art of record. Also, please note that the

cited art of record is directed to telephone service/voice call functions, whereby these features are much different from integrating conventional telephone sets and LAN type telephone sets in a single system.

Dependent Claims 3 and 4:

With respect to the rejection of claims 3 and 4, the Office Action asserts that column 25, lines 58-62, and column 26, lines 27-35 of Kung disclose the features recited in this claim. However, this assertion is incorrect. Column 25, line 53 to column 28, line 10 of Kung describes a situation in which an on-network user is making a call to an off-network user. This corresponds to a case in which a LAN type telephone set is making a call to a conventional type telephone set using the vernacular of the present invention, whereby claims 3 and 4 are directed to a case in which a LAN type telephone set is making a call to another LAN type telephone set. Accordingly, the disclosure from column 25, line 53 to column 28, line 10 of Kung is not material to such a situation.

Dependent claims 5 and 6:

With respect to claims 5 and 6, those claims are directed to a situation in which a call is made between a conventional type telephone set and a LAN type telephone set. However, column 25, line 53 to column 28, line 10 of Kung does not teach or suggest the features recited in these claims. In claims 5 and 6, the IP address of the gateway circuit is reported to the LAN type telephone set, and the IP address of the LAN type telephone set is reported to the gateway circuit, in order to establish a communication path between the conventional type telephone set and the gateway circuit.

In Kung, on the other hand, when a call is made by an on-network telephone set to an off-network telephone set, a call manager receives the call digits and determines if the call is to a valid number, and if so, the call manager issues a first call proceeding message to the gateway to indicate that the number is valid and that the call is proceeding. See column 26, lines 42-46 of Kung. If there are adequate resources to handle the call, as determined by the call manager, the call manager sends an open connection request to a voice

gateway in order to provide an open connection (see column 26, lines 59-64). Once the called party has answered the call and connection is established, the call manager sends a call start message to an accounting gateway to indicate the start of the call, the link gets established, and the call conversion may proceed. See column 27, lines 18-33 of Kung. None of these portions of Kung discloses or suggests that the IP address of the gateway circuit is reported to the LAN type telephone set and that the IP address of the LAN type telephone set is reported to the gateway circuit, as recited in claims 5 and 6.

Dependent claims 7-12:

With respect to claims 7-12, the Office Action asserts that column 10, lines 28-36 of White et al. discloses the features recited in these claims; however, this assertion is incorrect. As recited in claims 7-12, the plurality of conventional type telephone sets and the plurality of LAN type telephone sets are assigned a single extension number so that they are considered as a single group, and in which a call from one of the telephone sets in the single group results in a call-incoming processing to all of the telephone sets in the group.

White et al., on the other hand, merely describes that *82 is used as a prefix to make a telephone-to-telephone Internet call, and *83 is used to establish a communication once a telephone set has gone off hook. As further explained in column 10, lines 53-57, once the telephone set has dialed *83, the user is prompted to spell out the domain or host name of the called party. Thus, only one telephone set, that being the telephone set making a call request, is provided with call-incoming processing, and whereby the features of claims 7-12 are not taught or suggested by this portion of White et al.

New Claims:

New claims 14-21 have been added to recite additional features of the present invention that are believed to provide a separate basis of patentability for these claims.

Conclusion:

Applicant believes that the present application is now in condition for allowance, and an early indication of allowance is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by a check being in the wrong amount, unsigned, post-dated, otherwise improper or informal or even entirely missing, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. If any extensions of time are needed for timely acceptance of papers submitted herewith, Applicant hereby petitions for such extension under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 and authorizes payment of any such extensions fees to Deposit Account No. 19-0741.

Respectfully submitted,

Date September 30, 2004

Phillip J. Articola
Phillip J. Articola
Registration No. 38,819

FOLEY & LARDNER LLP

Customer Number: 22428

Telephone: (202) 672-5300

Facsimile: (202) 672-5399

Amendments to the Drawings:

Please substitute the attached sheet (Figure 4) of formal drawings for the corresponding sheet of informal drawings originally filed with the application.

The drawing sheet attached in connection with the above-identified application containing Figure 4 is being presented as a new formal drawing sheet to be substituted for the previously submitted drawing sheet containing Figure 4.

The specific changes which have been made to Figure 4 is to add a PRIOR ART label.